



Stability properties for quasilinear parabolic equations with measure data

Marie-Françoise Bidaut-Véron, Quoc-Hung Nguyen

► To cite this version:

Marie-Françoise Bidaut-Véron, Quoc-Hung Nguyen. Stability properties for quasilinear parabolic equations with measure data. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 2015, 17, pp.2103-2135. 10.4171/JEMS/552 . hal-01060682

HAL Id: hal-01060682

<https://hal.science/hal-01060682>

Submitted on 4 Sep 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Stability properties for quasilinear parabolic equations with measure data

Marie-Françoise BIDAUT-VERON*

Quoc-Hung NGUYEN†

Abstract

Let Ω be a bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^N , and $Q = \Omega \times (0, T)$. We study problems of the model type

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \Delta_p u = \mu & \text{in } Q, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u(0) = u_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $p > 1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ and $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$. Our main result is a *stability theorem* extending the results of Dal Maso, Murat, Orsina, Prignet, for the elliptic case, valid for quasilinear operators $u \mapsto \mathcal{A}(u) = \text{div}(A(x, t, \nabla u))$.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^N , and $Q = \Omega \times (0, T)$, $T > 0$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ the sets of bounded Radon measures on Ω and Q respectively. We are concerned with the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \text{div}(A(x, t, \nabla u)) = \mu & \text{in } Q, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u(0) = u_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$, $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and A is a Caratheodory function on $Q \times \mathbb{R}^N$, such that for *a.e.* $(x, t) \in Q$, and any $\xi, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$A(x, t, \xi) \cdot \xi \geq \Lambda_1 |\xi|^p, \quad |A(x, t, \xi)| \leq a(x, t) + \Lambda_2 |\xi|^{p-1}, \quad \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 > 0, a \in L^{p'}(Q), \quad (1.2)$$

$$(A(x, t, \xi) - A(x, t, \zeta)) \cdot (\xi - \zeta) > 0 \quad \text{if } \xi \neq \zeta, \quad (1.3)$$

for $p > 1$. This includes the model problem where $\text{div}(A(x, t, \nabla u)) = \Delta_p u$, where Δ_p is the p -Laplacian.

The corresponding elliptic problem:

$$-\Delta_p u = \mu \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

*Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique, CNRS UMR 7350, Faculté des Sciences, 37200 Tours France. E-mail: veronmf@univ-tours.fr

†Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique, CNRS UMR 7350, Faculté des Sciences, 37200 Tours France. E-mail: Hung.Nguyen-Quoc@lmpt.univ-tours.fr

with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$, was studied in [9, 10] for $p > 2 - 1/N$, leading to the existence of solutions in the sense of distributions. For any $p > 1$, and $\mu \in L^1(\Omega)$, existence and uniqueness are proved in [4] in the class of *entropy solutions*. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$ the main work is done in [14, Theorems 3.1, 3.2], where not only existence is proved in the class of *renormalized solutions*, but also a stability result, fundamental for applications.

Concerning problem (1.1), the first studies concern the case $\mu \in L^{p'}(Q)$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, where existence and uniqueness are obtained by variational methods, see [19]. In the general case $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$, the pionner results come from [9], proving the existence of solutions in the sense of distributions for

$$p > p_1 = 2 - \frac{1}{N+1}, \quad (1.4)$$

see also [11]. The approximated solutions of (1.1) lie in Marcinkiewicz spaces $u \in L^{p_c, \infty}(Q)$ and $|\nabla u| \in L^{m_c, \infty}(Q)$, where

$$p_c = p - 1 + \frac{p}{N}, \quad m_c = p - \frac{N}{N+1}. \quad (1.5)$$

This condition (1.4) ensures that u and $|\nabla u|$ belong to $L^1(Q)$, since $m_c > 1$ means $p > p_1$ and $p_c > 1$ means $p > 2N/(N+1)$. Uniqueness follows in the case $p = 2$, $A(x, t, \nabla u) = \nabla u$, by duality methods, see [21].

For $\mu \in L^1(Q)$, uniqueness is obtained in new classes of *entropy solutions*, and *renormalized solutions*, see [5, 26, 27].

A larger set of measures is studied in [15]. They introduce a notion of parabolic capacity initiated and inspired by [24], used after in [22, 23], defined by

$$c_p^Q(E) = \inf_{E \subset U} \inf_{\text{open } Q} \{ \|u\|_W : u \in W, u \geq \chi_U \text{ a.e. in } Q \},$$

for any Borel set $E \subset Q$, where setting $X = L^p((0, T); W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega))$,

$$W = \{z : z \in X, \quad z_t \in X'\}, \text{ embedded with the norm } \|u\|_W = \|u\|_X + \|u_t\|_{X'}.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_0(Q)$ be the set of Radon measures μ on Q that do not charge the sets of zero c_p^Q -capacity:

$$\forall E \text{ Borel set } \subset Q, \quad c_p^Q(E) = 0 \implies |\mu|(E) = 0.$$

Then existence and uniqueness of renormalized solutions of (1.1) hold for any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q) \cap \mathcal{M}_0(Q)$, called *soft (or diffuse, or regular) measure*, and $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$, and $p > 1$. The equivalence with the notion of entropy solutions is shown in [16]. For such a soft measure, an extension to equations of type $(b(u))_t - \Delta_p u = \mu$ is given in [6]; another formulation is used in [23] for solving a perturbed problem from (1.1) by an absorption term.

Next consider an *arbitrary measure* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$. Let $\mathcal{M}_s(Q)$ be the set of all bounded Radon measures on Q with support on a set of zero c_p^Q -capacity, also called *singular*. Let $\mathcal{M}_b^+(Q), \mathcal{M}_0^+(Q), \mathcal{M}_s^+(Q)$ be the positive cones of $\mathcal{M}_b(Q), \mathcal{M}_0(Q), \mathcal{M}_s(Q)$. From [15], μ can be written (in a unique way) under the form

$$\mu = \mu_0 + \mu_s, \quad \mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0(Q), \quad \mu_s = \mu_s^+ - \mu_s^-, \quad \mu_s^+, \mu_s^- \in \mathcal{M}_s^+(Q), \quad (1.6)$$

and $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0(Q)$ admits (at least) a decomposition under the form

$$\mu_0 = f - \text{div } g + h_t, \quad f \in L^1(Q), \quad g \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N, \quad h \in X, \quad (1.7)$$

and we write $\mu_0 = (f, g, h)$. Conversely, any measure of this form, *such that* $h \in L^\infty(Q)$, lies in $\mathcal{M}_0(Q)$, see [23, Proposition 3.1]. The solutions of (1.1) are searched in a renormalized sense linked to this decomposition, introduced in [15, 22]. In the range (1.4) the existence of a renormalized solution relative to the

decomposition (1.7) is proved in [22], using suitable approximations of μ_0 and μ_s . Uniqueness is still open, as well as in the elliptic case.

In *all the sequel* we suppose that p satisfies (1.4). Then the embedding $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ is valid, that means

$$X = L^p((0, T); W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)), \quad X' = L^{p'}((0, T); W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)).$$

In Section 2 we recall the definition of renormalized solutions, given in [22], that we call R-solutions of (1.1), relative to the decomposition (1.7) of μ_0 , and study some of their properties. Our main result is a *stability theorem* for problem (1.1), proved in Section 3, extending to the parabolic case the stability result of [14, Theorem 3.4]. In order to state it, we recall that a sequence of measures $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ converges to a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ in the *narrow topology* of measures if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q \varphi d\mu_n = \int_Q \varphi d\mu \quad \forall \varphi \in C(Q) \cap L^\infty(Q).$$

Theorem 1.1 *Let $A : Q \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfy (1.2), (1.3). Let $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$, and*

$$\mu = f - \operatorname{div} g + h_t + \mu_s^+ - \mu_s^- \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q),$$

with $f \in L^1(Q)$, $g \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N$, $h \in X$ and $\mu_s^+, \mu_s^- \in \mathcal{M}_s^+(Q)$. Let $u_{0,n} \in L^1(\Omega)$,

$$\mu_n = f_n - \operatorname{div} g_n + (h_n)_t + \rho_n - \eta_n \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q),$$

with $f_n \in L^1(Q)$, $g_n \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N$, $h_n \in X$, and $\rho_n, \eta_n \in \mathcal{M}_b^+(Q)$, such that

$$\rho_n = \rho_n^1 - \operatorname{div} \rho_n^2 + \rho_{n,s}, \quad \eta_n = \eta_n^1 - \operatorname{div} \eta_n^2 + \eta_{n,s},$$

with $\rho_n^1, \eta_n^1 \in L^1(Q)$, $\rho_n^2, \eta_n^2 \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and $\rho_{n,s}, \eta_{n,s} \in \mathcal{M}_s^+(Q)$. Assume that

$$\sup_n |\mu_n|(Q) < \infty,$$

and $\{u_{0,n}\}$ converges to u_0 strongly in $L^1(\Omega)$, $\{f_n\}$ converges to f weakly in $L^1(Q)$, $\{g_n\}$ converges to g strongly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$, $\{h_n\}$ converges to h strongly in X , $\{\rho_n\}$ converges to μ_s^+ and $\{\eta_n\}$ converges to μ_s^- in the narrow topology; and $\{\rho_n^1\}, \{\eta_n^1\}$ are bounded in $L^1(Q)$, and $\{\rho_n^2\}, \{\eta_n^2\}$ bounded in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$.

Let $\{u_n\}$ be a sequence of R-solutions of

$$\begin{cases} u_{n,t} - \operatorname{div}(A(x, t, \nabla u_n)) = \mu_n & \text{in } Q, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u_n(0) = u_{0,n} & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

relative to the decomposition $(f_n + \rho_n^1 - \eta_n^1, g_n + \rho_n^2 - \eta_n^2, h_n)$ of $\mu_{n,0}$. Let $U_n = u_n - h_n$.

Then up to a subsequence, $\{u_n\}$ converges a.e. in Q to a R-solution u of (1.1), and $\{U_n\}$ converges a.e. in Q to $U = u - h$. Moreover, $\{\nabla u_n\}, \{\nabla U_n\}$ converge respectively to $\nabla u, \nabla U$ a.e. in Q , and $\{T_k(U_n)\}$ converge to $T_k(U)$ strongly in X for any $k > 0$.

In Section 4 we check that any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ can be approximated in the sense of the stability Theorem, hence we find again the existence result of [22]:

Corollary 1.2 *Let $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$. Then there exists a R -solution u to the problem (1.1) with data (μ, u_0) .*

Moreover we give more precise properties of approximations of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$, fundamental for applications, see Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. As in the elliptic case, Theorem 1.1 is a key point for obtaining existence results for more general problems, and we give some of them in [2, 3, 20], for measures μ satisfying suitable capacity conditions. In [2] we study perturbed problems of order 0, of type

$$u_t - \Delta_p u + \mathcal{G}(u) = \mu \quad \text{in } Q, \quad (1.9)$$

where $\mathcal{G}(u)$ is an absorption or a source term with a growth of power or exponential type, and μ is a good in time measure. In [3] we use potential estimates to give other existence results in case of absorption with $p > 2$. In [20], one considers equations of the form

$$u_t - \operatorname{div}(A(x, t, \nabla u)) + \mathcal{G}(u, \nabla u) = \mu$$

under (1.2), (1.3) with $p = 2$, and extend in particular the results of [1] to nonlinear operators.

2 Renormalized solutions of problem (1.1)

2.1 Notations and Definition

For any function $f \in L^1(Q)$, we write $\int_Q f$ instead of $\int_Q f dx dt$, and for any measurable set $E \subset Q$, $\int_E f$ instead of $\int_E f dx dt$. For any open set ϖ of \mathbb{R}^m and $F \in (L^k(\varpi))^\nu$, $k \in [1, \infty]$, $m, \nu \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we set $\|F\|_{k, \varpi} = \|F\|_{(L^k(\varpi))^\nu}$.

We set $T_k(r) = \max\{\min\{r, k\}, -k\}$, for any $k > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. We recall that if u is a measurable function defined and finite *a.e.* in Q , such that $T_k(u) \in X$ for any $k > 0$, there exists a measurable function w from Q into \mathbb{R}^N such that $\nabla T_k(u) = \chi_{|u| \leq k} w$, *a.e.* in Q , and for any $k > 0$. We define the gradient ∇u of u by $w = \nabla u$.

Let $\mu = \mu_0 + \mu_s \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$, and (f, g, h) be a decomposition of μ_0 given by (1.7), and $\widehat{\mu}_0 = \mu_0 - h_t = f - \operatorname{div} g$. In the general case $\widehat{\mu}_0 \notin \mathcal{M}(Q)$, but we write, for convenience,

$$\int_Q w d\widehat{\mu}_0 := \int_Q (f w + g \cdot \nabla w), \quad \forall w \in X \cap L^\infty(Q).$$

Definition 2.1 *Let $u_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$, $\mu = \mu_0 + \mu_s \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$. A measurable function u is a **renormalized solution**, called **R-solution** of (1.1) if there exists a decomposition (f, g, h) of μ_0 such that*

$$U = u - h \in L^\sigma((0, T); W_0^{1, \sigma}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty((0, T); L^1(\Omega)), \quad \forall \sigma \in [1, m_c]; \quad T_k(U) \in X, \quad \forall k > 0, \quad (2.1)$$

and:

$$(i) \text{ for any } S \in W^{2, \infty}(\mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } S' \text{ has compact support on } \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } S(0) = 0, \\ - \int_\Omega S(u_0) \varphi(0) dx - \int_Q \varphi_t S(U) + \int_Q S'(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_Q S''(U) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \int_Q S'(U) \varphi d\widehat{\mu}_0, \quad (2.2)$$

for any $\varphi \in X \cap L^\infty(Q)$ such that $\varphi_t \in X' + L^1(Q)$ and $\varphi(\cdot, T) = 0$;

(ii) for any $\phi \in C(\overline{Q})$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \phi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \int_Q \phi d\mu_s^+ \quad (2.3)$$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{-m \geq U > -2m\}} \phi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \int_Q \phi d\mu_s^-. \quad (2.4)$$

Remark 2.2 As a consequence, $S(U) \in C([0, T]; L^1(\Omega))$ and $S(U)(\cdot, 0) = S(u_0)$ in Ω ; and u satisfies the equation

$$(S(U))_t - \operatorname{div}(S'(U)A(x, t, \nabla u)) + S''(U)A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = fS'(U) - \operatorname{div}(gS'(U)) + S''(U)g \cdot \nabla U, \quad (2.5)$$

in the sense of distributions in Q , see [22, Remark 3]. Moreover assume that $[-k, k] \supset \operatorname{supp} S'$. then from (1.2) and the Hölder inequality, we find easily that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(U)_t\|_{X' + L^1(Q)} &\leq C \|S\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} (\|\nabla u\|^p \chi_{|U| \leq k} \|_{1,Q}^{1/p'} + \|\nabla u\|^p \chi_{|U| \leq k} \|_{1,Q} + \|\nabla T_k(U)\|_{p,Q}^p \\ &\quad + \|a\|_{p',Q} + \|a\|_{p',Q}^{p'} + \|f\|_{1,Q} + \|g\|_{p',Q} \|\nabla u\|^p \chi_{|U| \leq k} \|_{1,Q}^{1/p} + \|g\|_{p',Q}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where $C = C(p, \Lambda_2)$. We also deduce that, for any $\varphi \in X \cap L^\infty(Q)$, such that $\varphi_t \in X' + L^1(Q)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega S(U(T))\varphi(T)dx - \int_\Omega S(u_0)\varphi(0)dx - \int_Q \varphi_t S(U) + \int_Q S'(U)A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \\ + \int_Q S''(U)A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U \varphi = \int_Q S'(U)\varphi d\widehat{\mu}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Remark 2.3 Let u, U satisfy (2.1). It is easy to see that the condition (2.3) (resp. (2.4)) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \phi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u = \int_Q \phi d\mu_s^+ \quad (2.8)$$

resp.

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \geq U > -2m\}} \phi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u = \int_Q \phi d\mu_s^-. \quad (2.9)$$

In particular, for any $\varphi \in L^{p'}(Q)$ there holds

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{m \leq |U| < 2m} |\nabla u| \varphi = 0, \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{m \leq |U| < 2m} |\nabla U| \varphi = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.4 (i) Any function $U \in X$ such that $U_t \in X' + L^1(Q)$ admits a unique c_p^Q -quasi continuous representative, defined c_p^Q -quasi a.e. in Q , still denoted U . Furthermore, if $U \in L^\infty(Q)$, then for any $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0(Q)$, there holds $U \in L^\infty(Q, d\mu_0)$, see [22, Theorem 3 and Corollary 1].

(ii) Let u be any R - solution of problem (1.1). Then, $U = u - h$ admits a c_p^Q -quasi continuous functions representative which is finite c_p^Q -quasi a.e. in Q , and u satisfies definition 2.1 for every decomposition $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{h})$ such that $h - \tilde{h} \in L^\infty(Q)$, see [22, Proposition 3 and Theorem 4].

2.2 Steklov and Landes approximations

A main difficulty for proving Theorem 1.1 is the choice of admissible test functions (S, φ) in (2.2), valid for any R -solution. Because of a lack of regularity of these solutions, we use two ways of approximation adapted to parabolic equations:

Definition 2.5 Let $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$ and $z \in L^1_{loc}(Q)$. For any $l \in (0, \varepsilon)$ we define the **Steklov time-averages** $[z]_l, [z]_{-l}$ of z by

$$[z]_l(x, t) = \frac{1}{l} \int_t^{t+l} z(x, s) ds \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T - \varepsilon),$$

$$[z]_{-l}(x, t) = \frac{1}{l} \int_{t-l}^t z(x, s) ds \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega \times (\varepsilon, T).$$

The idea to use this approximation for R -solutions can be found in [7]. Recall some properties, given in [23]. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$, and $\varphi_1 \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T])$, $\varphi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T])$ with $\text{Supp} \varphi_1 \subset \overline{\Omega} \times [0, T - \varepsilon]$, $\text{Supp} \varphi_2 \subset \overline{\Omega} \times [\varepsilon, T]$. There holds:

- (i) If $z \in X$, then $\varphi_1[z]_l$ and $\varphi_2[z]_{-l} \in W$.
- (ii) If $z \in X$ and $z_t \in X' + L^1(Q)$, then, as $l \rightarrow 0$, $(\varphi_1[z]_l)$ and $(\varphi_2[z]_{-l})$ converge respectively to $\varphi_1 z$ and $\varphi_2 z$ in X , and *a.e.* in Q ; and $(\varphi_1[z]_l)_t, (\varphi_2[z]_{-l})_t$ converge to $(\varphi_1 z)_t, (\varphi_2 z)_t$ in $X' + L^1(Q)$.
- (iii) If moreover $z \in L^\infty(Q)$, then from any sequence $\{l_n\} \rightarrow 0$, there exists a subsequence $\{l_\nu\}$ such that $\{[z]_{l_\nu}\}, \{[z]_{-l_\nu}\}$ converge to z, c_p^Q -quasi everywhere in Q .

Next we recall the approximation used in several articles [8, 12, 11], first introduced in [17].

Definition 2.6 Let $k > 0$, and $y \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $Y \in X$ such that $\|y\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq k$ and $\|Y\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq k$. For any $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, a **Landes-time approximation** $\langle Y \rangle_\nu$ of the function Y is defined as follows:

$$\langle Y \rangle_\nu(x, t) = \nu \int_0^t Y(x, s) e^{\nu(s-t)} ds + e^{-\nu t} z_\nu(x), \quad \forall (x, t) \in Q.$$

where $\{z_\nu\}$ is a sequence of functions in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, such that $\|z_\nu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq k$, $\{z_\nu\}$ converges to y *a.e.* in Ω , and $\nu^{-1} \|z_\nu\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}^p$ converges to 0.

Therefore, we can verify that $(\langle Y \rangle_\nu)_t \in X$, $\langle Y \rangle_\nu \in X \cap L^\infty(Q)$, $\|\langle Y \rangle_\nu\|_{\infty, Q} \leq k$ and $\{\langle Y \rangle_\nu\}$ converges to Y strongly in X and *a.e.* in Q . Moreover, $\langle Y \rangle_\nu$ satisfies the equation $(\langle Y \rangle_\nu)_t = \nu(Y - \langle Y \rangle_\nu)$ in the sense of distributions in Q , and $\langle Y \rangle_\nu(0) = z_\nu$ in Ω . In this paper, we only use the **Landes-time approximation** of the function $Y = T_k(U)$, where $y = T_k(u_0)$.

2.3 First properties

In the sequel we use the following notations: for any function $J \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, nondecreasing with $J(0) = 0$, we set

$$\overline{\mathcal{J}}(r) = \int_0^r J(\tau) d\tau, \quad \mathcal{J}(r) = \int_0^r J'(\tau) \tau d\tau. \quad (2.11)$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{J}(r) \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{J}(r) + \overline{\mathcal{J}}(r) = J(r)r, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{J}(r) - \mathcal{J}(s) \geq s(J(r) - J(s)) \quad \forall r, s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.12)$$

In particular we define, for any $k > 0$, and any $r \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\overline{T}_k(r) = \int_0^r T_k(\tau) d\tau, \quad \mathcal{T}_k(r) = \int_0^r T'_k(\tau) \tau d\tau, \quad (2.13)$$

and we use several times a truncature used in [14]:

$$H_m(r) = \chi_{[-m, m]}(r) + \frac{2m - |s|}{m} \chi_{m < |s| \leq 2m}(r), \quad \overline{H}_m(r) = \int_0^r H_m(\tau) d\tau. \quad (2.14)$$

The next Lemma allows to extend the range of the test functions in (2.2).

Lemma 2.7 *Let u be a R -solution of problem (1.1). Let $J \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R})$ be nondecreasing with $J(0) = 0$, and \overline{J} defined by (2.11). Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q S'(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla (\xi J(S(U))) + \int_Q S''(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U \xi J(S(U)) \\ & - \int_{\Omega} \xi(0) J(S(u_0)) S(u_0) dx - \int_Q \xi_t \overline{J}(S(U)) \leq \int_Q S'(U) \xi J(S(U)) d\widehat{\mu}_0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

for any $S \in W^{2, \infty}(\mathbb{R})$ such that S' has compact support on \mathbb{R} and $S(0) = 0$, and for any $\xi \in C^1(Q) \cap W^{1, \infty}(Q)$, $\xi \geq 0$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{J} be defined by (2.11). Let $\zeta \in C_c^1([0, T])$ with values in $[0, 1]$, such that $\zeta_t \leq 0$, and $\varphi = \zeta \xi [j(S(U))]_l$. Clearly, $\varphi \in X \cap L^\infty(Q)$; we choose the pair of functions (φ, S) as test function in (2.2). From the convergence properties of Steklov time-averages, we easily will obtain (2.15) if we prove that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow 0, \zeta \rightarrow 1} (- \int_Q (\zeta \xi [j(S(U))]_l)_t S(U)) \geq - \int_Q \xi_t \overline{J}(S(U)).$$

We can write $- \int_Q (\zeta \xi [j(S(U))]_l)_t S(U) = F + G$, with

$$F = - \int_Q (\zeta \xi)_t [j(S(U))]_l S(U), \quad G = - \int_Q \zeta \xi S(U) \frac{1}{l} (j(S(U))(x, t + l) - j(S(U))(x, t)).$$

Using (2.12) and integrating by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned} G & \geq - \int_Q \zeta \xi \frac{1}{l} (\mathcal{J}(S(U))(x, t + l) - \mathcal{J}(S(U))(x, t)) = - \int_Q \zeta \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial t} ([\mathcal{J}(S(U))]_l) \\ & = \int_Q (\zeta \xi)_t [\mathcal{J}(S(U))]_l + \int_{\Omega} \zeta(0) \xi(0) [\mathcal{J}(S(U))]_l(0) dx \geq \int_Q (\zeta \xi)_t [\mathcal{J}(S(U))]_l, \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{J}(S(U)) \geq 0$. Hence,

$$- \int_Q (\zeta \xi [j(S(U))]_l)_t S(U) \geq \int_Q (\zeta \xi)_t [\mathcal{J}(S(U))]_l + F = \int_Q (\zeta \xi)_t ([\mathcal{J}(S(U))]_l - [J(S(U))]_l S(U)).$$

Otherwise, $\mathcal{J}(S(U))$ and $J(S(U)) \in C([0, T]; L^1(\Omega))$, thus $\{(\zeta \xi)_t ([\mathcal{J}(S(u))]_l - [J(S(u))]_l S(u))\}$ converges to $-(\zeta \xi)_t \overline{J}(S(u))$ in $L^1(Q)$ as $l \rightarrow 0$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow 0, \zeta \rightarrow 1} (- \int_Q (\zeta \xi [J(S(U))]_l)_t S(U)) \geq \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 1} \left(- \int_Q (\zeta \xi)_t \overline{J}(S(U)) \right) \geq - \int_Q \xi_t \overline{J}(S(U)),$$

which achieves the proof. \blacksquare

Next we give estimates of the function and its gradient, following the first ones of [11], inspired by the estimates of the elliptic case of [4]. In particular we extend and make more precise the a priori estimates of [22, Proposition 4] given for solutions with smooth data; see also [15, 18].

Proposition 2.8 *If u is a R -solution of problem (1.1), then there exists $C_1 = C_1(p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ such that, for any $k \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 0$,*

$$\int_{\ell \leq |U| \leq \ell+k} |\nabla u|^p + \int_{\ell \leq |U| \leq \ell+k} |\nabla U|^p \leq C_1 k M, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\|U\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} \leq C_1(M + |\Omega|), \quad (2.17)$$

where $M = \|u_0\|_{1,\Omega} + |\mu_s|(Q) + \|f\|_{1,Q} + \|g\|_{p',Q}^{p'} + \|h\|_X^p + \|a\|_{p',Q}^{p'}$.
As a consequence, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\text{meas}\{|U| > k\} \leq C_2 M_1 k^{-p_c}, \quad \text{meas}\{|\nabla U| > k\} \leq C_2 M_2 k^{-m_c}, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\text{meas}\{|u| > k\} \leq C_2 M_2 k^{-p_c}, \quad \text{meas}\{|\nabla u| > k\} \leq C_2 M_2 k^{-m_c}, \quad (2.19)$$

where $C_2 = C_2(N, p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$, and $M_1 = (M + |\Omega|)^{\frac{p}{N}} M$ and $M_2 = M_1 + M$.

Proof. Set for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and $m, k, \ell > 0$,

$$T_{k,\ell}(r) = \max\{\min\{r - \ell, k\}, 0\} + \min\{\max\{r + \ell, -k\}, 0\}.$$

For $m > k + \ell$, we can choose $(J, S, \xi) = (T_{k,\ell}, \overline{H_m}, \xi)$ as test functions in (2.15), where $\overline{H_m}$ is defined at (2.14) and $\xi \in C^1([0, T])$ with values in $[0, 1]$, independent on x . Since $T_{k,\ell}(\overline{H_m}(r)) = T_{k,\ell}(r)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\Omega} \xi(0) T_{k,\ell}(u_0) \overline{H_m}(u_0) dx - \int_Q \xi_t \overline{T_{k,\ell}}(\overline{H_m}(U)) \\ & + \int_{\{\ell \leq |U| < \ell+k\}} \xi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U - \frac{k}{m} \int_{\{m \leq |U| < 2m\}} \xi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U \leq \int_Q H_m(U) \xi T_{k,\ell}(U) d\widehat{\mu}_0. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\int_Q H_m(U) \xi T_{k,\ell}(U) d\widehat{\mu}_0 = \int_Q H_m(U) \xi T_{k,\ell}(U) f + \int_{\{\ell \leq |U| < \ell+k\}} \xi \nabla U \cdot g - \frac{k}{m} \int_{\{m \leq |U| < 2m\}} \xi \nabla U \cdot g.$$

Let $m \rightarrow \infty$; then, for any $k \geq 1$, since $U \in L^1(Q)$ and from (2.3), (2.4), and (2.10), we find

$$- \int_Q \xi_t \overline{T_{k,\ell}}(U) + \int_{\{\ell \leq |U| < \ell+k\}} \xi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U \leq \int_{\{\ell \leq |U| < \ell+k\}} \xi \nabla U \cdot g + k(\|u_0\|_{1,\Omega} + |\mu_s|(Q) + \|f\|_{1,Q}). \quad (2.20)$$

Next, we take $\xi \equiv 1$. We verify that

$$A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U - \nabla U \cdot g \geq \frac{\Lambda_1}{4} (|\nabla u|^p + |\nabla U|^p) - c_1 (|g|^{p'} + |\nabla h|^p + |a|^{p'})$$

for some $c_1 = c_1(p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) > 0$. Hence (2.16) follows. Thus, from (2.20) and the Hölder inequality, we get, for any $\xi \in C^1([0, T])$ with values in $[0, 1]$,

$$- \int_Q \xi_t \overline{T_{k,\ell}}(U) \leq c_2 k M$$

for some $c_2 = c_2(p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) > 0$. Thus $\int_{\Omega} \overline{T_{k,\ell}}(U)(t) dx \leq c_2 k M$, for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$. We deduce (2.17) by taking $k = 1, \ell = 0$, since $\overline{T_{1,0}}(r) = \overline{T_1}(r) \geq |r| - 1$, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

Next, from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg embedding Theorem, see [13, Proposition 3.1], we have

$$\int_Q |T_k(U)|^{\frac{p(N+1)}{N}} \leq c_3 \|U\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))}^{\frac{p}{N}} \int_Q |\nabla T_k(U)|^p,$$

where $c_3 = c_3(N, p)$. Then, from (2.16) and (2.17), we get, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\text{meas}\{|U| > k\} \leq k^{-\frac{p(N+1)}{N}} \int_Q |T_k(U)|^{\frac{p(N+1)}{N}} \leq c_3 \|U\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))}^{\frac{p}{N}} k^{-\frac{p(N+1)}{N}} \int_Q |\nabla T_k(U)|^p \leq c_4 M_1 k^{-p_c},$$

with $c_4 = c_4(N, p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{meas}\{|\nabla U| > k\} &\leq \frac{1}{k^p} \int_0^{k^p} \text{meas}(\{|\nabla U|^p > s\}) ds \\ &\leq \text{meas}\left\{|U| > k^{\frac{N}{N+1}}\right\} + \frac{1}{k^p} \int_0^{k^p} \text{meas}\left(\left\{|\nabla U|^p > s, |U| \leq k^{\frac{N}{N+1}}\right\}\right) ds \\ &\leq c_4 M_1 k^{-m_c} + \frac{1}{k^p} \int_{|U| \leq k^{\frac{N}{N+1}}} |\nabla U|^p \leq c_5 M_2 k^{-m_c}, \end{aligned}$$

with $c_5 = c_5(N, p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$. Furthermore, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\text{meas}\{|h| > k\} + \text{meas}\{|\nabla h| > k\} \leq c_6 k^{-p} \|h\|_X^p,$$

where $c_6 = c_6(N, p)$. Therefore, we easily get (2.19). ■

Remark 2.9 If $\mu \in L^1(Q)$ and $a \equiv 0$ in (1.2), then (2.16) holds for all $k > 0$ and the term $|\Omega|$ in inequality (2.17) can be removed, where $M = \|u_0\|_{1,\Omega} + |\mu|(Q)$. Furthermore, (2.19) is stated as follows:

$$\text{meas}\{|u| > k\} \leq C_2 M^{\frac{p+N}{N}} k^{-p_c}, \quad \text{meas}\{|\nabla u| > k\} \leq C_2 M^{\frac{N+2}{N+1}} k^{-m_c}, \quad \forall k > 0. \quad (2.21)$$

with $C_2 = C_2(N, p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$. To see last inequality, we do in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{meas}\{|\nabla U| > k\} &\leq \text{meas}\left\{|U| > M^{\frac{1}{N+1}} k^{\frac{N}{N+1}}\right\} + \frac{1}{k^p} \int_0^{k^p} \text{meas}\left\{|\nabla U|^p > s, |U| \leq M^{\frac{1}{N+1}} k^{\frac{N}{N+1}}\right\} ds \\ &\leq C_2 M^{\frac{N+2}{N+1}} k^{-m_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.10 Let $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$, and $\{u_{0,n}\} \subset L^1(\Omega)$, such that

$$\sup_n |\mu_n|(Q) < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_n \|u_{0,n}\|_{1,\Omega} < \infty.$$

Let u_n be a R-solution of (1.1) with data $\mu_n = \mu_{n,0} + \mu_{n,s}$ and $u_{0,n}$, relative to a decomposition (f_n, g_n, h_n) of $\mu_{n,0}$, and $U_n = u_n - h_n$. Assume that $\{f_n\}$ is bounded in $L^1(Q)$, $\{g_n\}$ bounded in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and $\{h_n\}$ bounded in X .

Then, up to a subsequence, $\{U_n\}$ converges a.e. to a function $U \in L^\infty((0, T); L^1(\Omega))$, such that $T_k(U) \in X$ for any $k > 0$ and $U \in L^\sigma((0, T); W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega))$ for any $\sigma \in [1, m_c)$. And

- (i) $\{U_n\}$ converges to U strongly in $L^\sigma(Q)$ for any $\sigma \in [1, m_c)$, and $\sup \|U_n\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} < \infty$,
- (ii) $\sup_{k>0} \sup_n \frac{1}{k+1} \int_Q |\nabla T_k(U_n)|^p < \infty$,
- (iii) $\{T_k(U_n)\}$ converges to $T_k(U)$ weakly in X , for any $k > 0$,
- (iv) $\{A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n))\}$ converges to some F_k weakly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$.

Proof. Take $S \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ such that S' has compact support on \mathbb{R} and $S(0) = 0$. We combine (2.6) with (2.16), and deduce that $\{S(U_n)_t\}$ is bounded in $X' + L^1(Q)$ and $\{S(U_n)\}$ bounded in X . Hence, $\{S(U_n)\}$ is relatively compact in $L^1(Q)$. On the other hand, we choose $S = S_k$ such that $S_k(z) = z$, if $|z| < k$ and $S_k(z) = 2k \operatorname{sign} z$, if $|z| > 2k$. From (2.17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{meas} \{|U_n - U_m| > \sigma\} &\leq \operatorname{meas} \{|U_n| > k\} + \operatorname{meas} \{|U_m| > k\} + \operatorname{meas} \{|S_k(U_n) - S_k(U_m)| > \sigma\} \\ &\leq \frac{c}{k} + \operatorname{meas} \{|S_k(U_n) - S_k(U_m)| > \sigma\}, \end{aligned}$$

where c does not depend of n, m . Thus, up to a subsequence $\{u_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in measure, and converges a.e. in Q to a function u . Thus, $\{T_k(U_n)\}$ converges to $T_k(U)$ weakly in X , since $\sup_n \|T_k(U_n)\|_X < \infty$ for any $k > 0$. And $\{|\nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n)|^{p-2} \nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n)\}$ converges to some F_k weakly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$. Furthermore, from (2.18), $\{U_n\}$ strongly converges to U in $L^\sigma(Q)$, for any $\sigma < p_c$. \blacksquare

3 The convergence theorem

We first recall some properties of the measures, see [22, Lemma 5], [14].

Proposition 3.1 *Let $\mu_s = \mu_s^+ - \mu_s^- \in \mathcal{M}_b(Q)$, where μ_s^+ and μ_s^- are concentrated, respectively, on two disjoint sets E^+ and E^- of zero c_p^Q -capacity. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exist two compact sets $K_\delta^+ \subseteq E^+$ and $K_\delta^- \subseteq E^-$ such that*

$$\mu_s^+(E^+ \setminus K_\delta^+) \leq \delta, \quad \mu_s^-(E^- \setminus K_\delta^-) \leq \delta,$$

and there exist $\psi_\delta^+, \psi_\delta^- \in C_c^1(Q)$ with values in $[0, 1]$, such that $\psi_\delta^+, \psi_\delta^- = 1$ respectively on K_δ^+, K_δ^- , and $\operatorname{supp}(\psi_\delta^+) \cap \operatorname{supp}(\psi_\delta^-) = \emptyset$, and

$$\|\psi_\delta^+\|_X + \|(\psi_\delta^+)_t\|_{X'+L^1(Q)} \leq \delta, \quad \|\psi_\delta^-\|_X + \|(\psi_\delta^-)_t\|_{X'+L^1(Q)} \leq \delta.$$

There exist decompositions $(\psi_\delta^+)_t = (\psi_\delta^+)_t^1 + (\psi_\delta^+)_t^2$ and $(\psi_\delta^-)_t = (\psi_\delta^-)_t^1 + (\psi_\delta^-)_t^2$ in $X' + L^1(Q)$, such that

$$\left\|(\psi_\delta^+)_t^1\right\|_{X'} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}, \quad \left\|(\psi_\delta^+)_t^2\right\|_{1,Q} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}, \quad \left\|(\psi_\delta^-)_t^1\right\|_{X'} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}, \quad \left\|(\psi_\delta^-)_t^2\right\|_{1,Q} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}. \quad (3.1)$$

*Both $\{\psi_\delta^+\}$ and $\{\psi_\delta^-\}$ converge to 0, weak- * in $L^\infty(Q)$, and strongly in $L^1(Q)$ and up to subsequences, a.e. in Q , as δ tends to 0.*

Moreover if ρ_n and η_n are as in Theorem 1.1, we have, for any $\delta, \delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$,

$$\int_Q \psi_\delta^- d\rho_n + \int_Q \psi_\delta^+ d\eta_n = \omega(n, \delta), \quad \int_Q \psi_\delta^- d\mu_s^+ \leq \delta, \quad \int_Q \psi_\delta^+ d\mu_s^- \leq \delta, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\int_Q (1 - \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+) d\rho_n = \omega(n, \delta_1, \delta_2), \quad \int_Q (1 - \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+) d\mu_s^+ \leq \delta_1 + \delta_2, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\int_Q (1 - \psi_{\delta_1}^- \psi_{\delta_2}^-) d\eta_n = \omega(n, \delta_1, \delta_2), \quad \int_Q (1 - \psi_{\delta_1}^- \psi_{\delta_2}^-) d\mu_s^- \leq \delta_1 + \delta_2. \quad (3.4)$$

Hereafter, if $n, \varepsilon, \dots, \nu$ are real numbers, and a function ϕ depends on $n, \varepsilon, \dots, \nu$ and eventual other parameters $\alpha, \beta, \dots, \gamma$, and $n \rightarrow n_0, \varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon_0, \dots, \nu \rightarrow \nu_0$, we write $\phi = \omega(n, \varepsilon, \dots, \nu)$, then this means that, for fixed $\alpha, \beta, \dots, \gamma$, there holds $\overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \nu_0} \dots \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon_0} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow n_0} |\phi| = 0$. In the same way, $\phi \leq \omega(n, \varepsilon, \delta, \dots, \nu)$ means $\overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \nu_0} \dots \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon_0} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow n_0} \phi \leq 0$, and $\phi \geq \omega(n, \varepsilon, \dots, \nu)$ means $-\phi \leq \omega(n, \varepsilon, \dots, \nu)$.

Remark 3.2 In the sequel we recall a convergence property still used in [14]: If $\{b_{1,n}\}$ is a sequence in $L^1(Q)$ converging to b_1 weakly in $L^1(Q)$ and $\{b_{2,n}\}$ a bounded sequence in $L^\infty(Q)$ converging to b_2 , a.e. in Q , then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q b_{1,n} b_{2,n} = \int_Q b_1 b_2$.

Next we prove Theorem 1.1.

Scheme of the proof. Let $\{\mu_n\}, \{u_{0,n}\}$ and $\{u_n\}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Then we can apply Proposition 2.10. Setting $U_n = u_n - h_n$, up to subsequences, $\{u_n\}$ converges a.e. in Q to some function u , and $\{U_n\}$ converges a.e. to $U = u - h$, such that $T_k(U) \in X$ for any $k > 0$, and $U \in L^\sigma((0, T); W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty((0, T); L^1(\Omega))$ for every $\sigma \in [1, m_c)$. And $\{U_n\}$ satisfies the conclusions (i) to (iv) of Proposition 2.10. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n &= (f_n - \operatorname{div} g_n + (h_n)_t) + (\rho_n^1 - \operatorname{div} \rho_n^2) - (\eta_n^1 - \operatorname{div} \eta_n^2) + \rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s} \\ &= \mu_{n,0} + (\rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s})^+ - (\rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s})^-, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mu_{n,0} = \lambda_{n,0} + \rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}, \quad \text{with } \lambda_{n,0} = f_n - \operatorname{div} g_n + (h_n)_t, \quad \rho_{n,0} = \rho_n^1 - \operatorname{div} \rho_n^2, \quad \eta_{n,0} = \eta_n^1 - \operatorname{div} \eta_n^2. \quad (3.5)$$

Hence

$$\rho_{n,0}, \eta_{n,0} \in \mathcal{M}_b^+(Q) \cap \mathcal{M}_0(Q), \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_n \geq \rho_{n,0}, \quad \eta_n \geq \eta_{n,0}. \quad (3.6)$$

Let E^+, E^- be the sets where, respectively, μ_s^+ and μ_s^- are concentrated. For any $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, let $\psi_{\delta_1}^+, \psi_{\delta_2}^+$ and $\psi_{\delta_1}^-, \psi_{\delta_2}^-$ as in Proposition 3.1 and set

$$\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} = \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ + \psi_{\delta_1}^- \psi_{\delta_2}^-.$$

Suppose that we can prove the two estimates, near E

$$I_1 := \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) \leq \omega(n, \nu, \delta_1, \delta_2), \quad (3.7)$$

and far from E ,

$$I_2 := \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) \leq \omega(n, \nu, \delta_1, \delta_2). \quad (3.8)$$

Then it follows that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n, \nu} \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) \leq 0, \quad (3.9)$$

which implies

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (U_n - T_k(U)) \leq 0, \quad (3.10)$$

since $\{\langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu\}$ converges to $T_k(U)$ in X . On the other hand, from the weak convergence of $\{T_k(U_n)\}$ to $T_k(U)$ in X , we verify that

$$\int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla(T_k(U_n) - T_k(U)) = \omega(n).$$

Thus we get

$$\int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} (A(x, t, \nabla u_n) - A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U) + h_n))) \cdot \nabla(u_n - (T_k(U) + h_n)) = \omega(n).$$

Then, it is easy to show that, up to a subsequence,

$$\{\nabla u_n\} \text{ converges to } \nabla u, \quad a.e. \text{ in } Q. \quad (3.11)$$

Therefore, $\{A(x, t, \nabla u_n)\}$ converges to $A(x, t, \nabla u)$ weakly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$; and from (3.10) we find

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla T_k(U_n) \leq \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla u) \nabla T_k(U).$$

Otherwise, $\{A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n))\}$ converges weakly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$ to some F_k , from Proposition 2.10, and we obtain that $F_k = A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U) + h))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n) \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla T_k(U_n) + \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla h_n \\ & \leq \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla(T_k(U) + h)) \cdot \nabla(T_k(U) + h). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence

$$\{T_k(U_n)\} \text{ converges to } T_k(U), \text{ strongly in } X, \quad \forall k > 0. \quad (3.12)$$

Then to finish the proof we have to check that u is a solution of (1.1). ■

In order to prove (3.7) we need a first Lemma, inspired of [14, Lemma 6.1]. It extends the results of [22, Lemma 6 and Lemma 7] relative to sequences of solutions with smooth data:

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\psi_{1,\delta}, \psi_{2,\delta} \in C^1(Q)$ be uniformly bounded in $W^{1,\infty}(Q)$ with values in $[0, 1]$, and such that $\int_Q \psi_{1,\delta} d\mu_s^- \leq \delta$ and $\int_Q \psi_{2,\delta} d\mu_s^+ \leq \delta$. Let $\{u_n\}$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, and $U_n = u_n - h_n$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U_n < 2m\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U_n < 2m\}} |\nabla U_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\frac{1}{m} \int_{-2m < U_n \leq -m} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{1,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad \frac{1}{m} \int_{-2m < U_n \leq -m} |\nabla U_n|^p \psi_{1,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad (3.14)$$

and for any $k > 0$,

$$\int_{\{m \leq U_n < m+k\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad \int_{\{m \leq U_n < m+k\}} |\nabla U_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad (3.15)$$

$$\int_{\{-m-k < U_n \leq -m\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{1,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta), \quad \int_{\{-m-k < U_n \leq -m\}} |\nabla U_n|^p \psi_{1,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta). \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. (i) Proof of (3.13), (3.14). Set for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $m, \ell \geq 1$

$$S_{m,\ell}(r) = \int_0^r \left(\frac{-m+\tau}{m} \chi_{[m,2m]}(\tau) + \chi_{(2m,2m+\ell]}(\tau) + \frac{4m+2h-\tau}{2m+\ell} \chi_{(2m+\ell,4m+2h]}(\tau) \right) d\tau,$$

$$S_m(r) = \int_0^r \left(\frac{-m+\tau}{m} \chi_{[m,2m]}(\tau) + \chi_{(2m,\infty)}(\tau) \right) d\tau.$$

Note that $S''_{m,\ell} = \chi_{[m,2m]}/m - \chi_{[2m+\ell,2(2m+\ell)]}/(2m+\ell)$. We choose $(\xi, J, S) = (\psi_{2,\delta}, T_1, S_{m,\ell})$ as test functions in (2.15) for u_n , and observe that, from (3.5),

$$\widehat{\mu_{n,0}} = \mu_{n,0} - (h_n)_t = \widehat{\lambda_{n,0}} + \rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0} = f_n - \operatorname{div} g_n + \rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}. \quad (3.17)$$

Thus we can write $\sum_{i=1}^6 A_i \leq \sum_{i=7}^{12} A_i$, where

$$A_1 = - \int_{\Omega} \psi_{2,\delta}(0) T_1(S_{m,\ell}(u_{0,n})) S_{m,\ell}(u_{0,n}) dx, \quad A_2 = - \int_Q (\psi_{2,\delta})_t \overline{T_1}(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)),$$

$$A_3 = \int_Q S'_{m,\ell}(U_n) T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla \psi_{2,\delta}, \quad A_4 = \int_Q (S'_{m,\ell}(U_n))^2 \psi_{2,\delta} T'_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla U_n,$$

$$A_5 = \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U_n \leq 2m\}} \psi_{2,\delta} T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla U_n,$$

$$A_6 = - \frac{1}{2m+\ell} \int_{\{2m+\ell \leq U_n < 2(2m+\ell)\}} \psi_{2,\delta} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla U_n,$$

$$A_7 = \int_Q S'_{m,\ell}(U_n) T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) \psi_{2,\delta} f_n, \quad A_8 = \int_Q S'_{m,\ell}(U_n) T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) g_n \cdot \nabla \psi_{2,\delta},$$

$$A_9 = \int_Q (S'_{m,\ell}(U_n))^2 T'_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) \psi_{2,\delta} g_n \cdot \nabla U_n, \quad A_{10} = \frac{1}{m} \int_{m \leq U_n \leq 2m} T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) \psi_{2,\delta} g_n \cdot \nabla U_n,$$

$$A_{11} = - \frac{1}{2m+\ell} \int_{\{2m+\ell \leq U_n < 2(2m+\ell)\}} \psi_{2,\delta} g_n \cdot \nabla U_n, \quad A_{12} = \int_Q S'_{m,\ell}(U_n) T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) \psi_{2,\delta} d(\rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}).$$

Since $\|S_{m,\ell}(u_{0,n})\|_{1,\Omega} \leq \int_{\{m \leq u_{0,n}\}} u_{0,n} dx$, we find $A_1 = \omega(\ell, n, m)$. Otherwise

$$|A_2| \leq \|\psi_{2,\delta}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Q)} \int_{\{m \leq U_n\}} U_n, \quad |A_3| \leq \|\psi_{2,\delta}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(Q)} \int_{\{m \leq U_n\}} (|a| + \Lambda_2 |\nabla u_n|^{p-1}),$$

which imply $A_2 = \omega(\ell, n, m)$ and $A_3 = \omega(\ell, n, m)$. Using (2.3) for u_n , we have

$$A_6 = - \int_Q \psi_{2,\delta} d(\rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s})^+ + \omega(\ell) = \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta).$$

Hence $A_6 = \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta)$, since $(\rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s})^+$ converges to μ_s^+ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the narrow topology, and $\int_Q \psi_{2,\delta} d\mu_s^+ \leq \delta$. We also obtain $A_{11} = \omega(\ell)$ from (2.10).

Now $\{S'_{m,\ell}(U_n)T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n))\}_\ell$ converges to $S'_m(U)T_1(S_m(U))$, $\{S'_m(U_n)T_1(S_m(U_n))\}_n$ converges to $S'_m(U)T_1(S_m(U))$, $\{S'_m(U)T_1(S_m(U))\}_m$ converges to 0, weak-* in $L^\infty(Q)$ and $\{f_n\}$ converges to f weakly in $L^1(Q)$, $\{g_n\}$ converges to g strongly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$. From Remark 3.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_7 &= \int_Q S'_m(U_n)T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n))\psi_{2,\delta}f_n + \omega(\ell) = \int_Q S'_m(U)T_1(S_m(U))\psi_{2,\delta}f + \omega(\ell, n) = \omega(\ell, n, m), \\ A_8 &= \int_Q S'_m(U_n)T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n))g_n \cdot \nabla \psi_{2,\delta} + \omega(\ell) = \int_Q S'_m(U)T_1(S_m(U))g \cdot \nabla \psi_{2,\delta} + \omega(\ell, n) = \omega(\ell, n, m). \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, $A_{12} \leq \int_Q \psi_{2,\delta} d\rho_n$, and $\{\int_Q \psi_{2,\delta} d\rho_n\}$ converges to $\int_Q \psi_{2,\delta} d\mu_s^+$, thus $A_{12} \leq \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta)$. Using Holder inequality and the condition (1.2), we have

$$g_n \cdot \nabla U_n - A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla U_n \leq c_1 \left(|g_n|^{p'} + |\nabla h_n|^p + |a|^{p'} \right)$$

with $c_1 = c_1(p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$, which implies

$$A_9 - A_4 \leq c_1 \int_Q (S'_{m,\ell}(U_n))^2 T'_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) \psi_{2,\delta} \left(|g_n|^{p'} + |h_n|^p + |a|^{p'} \right) = \omega(\ell, n, m).$$

Similarly we also show that $A_{10} - A_5/2 \leq \omega(\ell, n, m)$. Combining the estimates, we get $A_5/2 \leq \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta)$. Using Holder inequality we have

$$A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla U_n \geq \frac{\Lambda_1}{2} |\nabla u_n|^p - c_2 (|a|^{p'} + |\nabla h_n|^p).$$

with $c_2 = c_2(p, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$, which implies

$$\frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U_n < 2m\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} T_1(S_{m,\ell}(U_n)) = \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta).$$

Note that for all $m > 4$, $S_{m,\ell}(r) \geq 1$ for any $r \in [\frac{3}{2}m, 2m]$; hence $T_1(S_{m,\ell}(r)) = 1$. So,

$$\frac{1}{m} \int_{\{\frac{3}{2}m \leq U_n < 2m\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta).$$

Since $|\nabla U_n|^p \leq 2^{p-1} |\nabla u_n|^p + 2^{p-1} |\nabla h_n|^p$, there also holds

$$\frac{1}{m} \int_{\{\frac{3}{2}m \leq U_n < 2m\}} |\nabla U_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta).$$

We deduce (3.13) by summing on each set $\{(\frac{4}{3})^i m \leq U_n \leq (\frac{4}{3})^{i+1} m\}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. Similarly, we can choose $(\xi, \psi, S) = (\psi_{1,\delta}, T_1, \tilde{S}_{m,\ell})$ as test functions in (2.15) for u_n , where $\tilde{S}_{m,\ell}(r) = S_{m,\ell}(-r)$, and we obtain (3.14).

(ii) Proof of (3.15), (3.16). We set, for any $k, m, \ell \geq 1$,

$$S_{k,m,\ell}(r) = \int_0^r \left(T_k(\tau - T_m(\tau)) \chi_{[m, k+m+\ell]} + k \frac{2(k+\ell+m) - \tau}{k+m+\ell} \chi_{(k+m+\ell, 2(k+m+\ell))} \right) d\tau$$

$$S_{k,m}(r) = \int_0^r T_k(\tau - T_m(\tau)) \chi_{[m,\infty)} d\tau.$$

We choose $(\xi, \psi, S) = (\psi_{2,\delta}, T_1, S_{k,m,\ell})$ as test functions in (2.15) for u_n . In the same way we also obtain

$$\int_{\{m \leq U_n < m+k\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} T_1(S_{k,m,\ell}(U_n)) = \omega(\ell, n, m, \delta).$$

Note that $T_1(S_{k,m,\ell}(r)) = 1$ for any $r \geq m+1$, thus $\int_{\{m+1 \leq U_n < m+k\}} |\nabla u_n|^p \psi_{2,\delta} = \omega(n, m, \delta)$, which implies (3.15) by changing m into $m-1$. Similarly, we obtain (3.16). \blacksquare

Next we look at the behaviour near E .

Lemma 3.4 *Estimate (3.7) holds.*

Proof. There holds

$$I_1 = \int_Q \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla T_k(U_n) - \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu.$$

From Proposition 2.10, (iv), $\{A(x, t, \nabla (T_k(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu\}$ converges weakly in $L^1(Q)$ to $F_k \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu$. And $\{\chi_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}}\}$ converges to $\chi_{|U| \leq k}$, *a.e.* in Q , and $\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$ converges to 0 *a.e.* in Q as $\delta_1 \rightarrow 0$, and $\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$ takes its values in $[0, 1]$. From Remark 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu &= \int_Q \chi_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} A(x, t, \nabla (T_k(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu \\ &= \int_Q \chi_{|U| \leq k} \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} F_k \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \nu, \delta_1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we prove that

$$\int_Q \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla T_k(U_n) \leq \omega(n, \delta_1, \delta_2), \quad (3.18)$$

then we deduce (3.7). As noticed in [14, 22], it is precisely for this estimate that we need the double cut $\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+$. To do this, we set, for any $m > k > 0$, and any $r \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\hat{S}_{k,m}(r) = \int_0^r (k - T_k(\tau)) H_m(\tau) d\tau,$$

where H_m is defined at (2.14). Hence $\text{supp } \hat{S}_{k,m} \subset [-2m, k]$; and $\hat{S}_{k,m}'' = -\chi_{[-k,k]} + \frac{2k}{m} \chi_{[-2m,-m]}$. We choose $(\varphi, S) = (\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+, \hat{S}_{k,m})$ as test functions in (2.2). From (3.17), we can write

$$A_1 + A_2 - A_3 + A_4 + A_5 + A_6 = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= - \int_Q (\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+)_t \hat{S}_{k,m}(U_n), \quad A_2 = \int_Q (k - T_k(U_n)) H_m(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+), \\ A_3 &= \int_Q \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla T_k(U_n), \quad A_4 = \frac{2k}{m} \int_{\{-2m < U_n \leq -m\}} \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n, \\ A_5 &= - \int_Q (k - T_k(U_n)) H_m(U_n) \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ d\widehat{\lambda}_{n,0}, \quad A_6 = \int_Q (k - T_k(U_n)) H_m(U_n) \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ d(\eta_{n,0} - \rho_{n,0}). \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate A_3 . As in [22, p.585], since $\{\hat{S}_{k,m}(U_n)\}$ converges to $\hat{S}_{k,m}(U)$ weakly in X , and $\hat{S}_{k,m}(U) \in L^\infty(Q)$, using (3.1), we find

$$A_1 = - \int_Q (\psi_{\delta_1}^+)_t \psi_{\delta_2}^+ \hat{S}_{k,m}(U) - \int_Q \psi_{\delta_1}^+ (\psi_{\delta_2}^+)_t \hat{S}_{k,m}(U) + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \delta_1).$$

Next consider A_2 . Notice that $U_n = T_{2m}(U_n)$ on $\text{supp}(H_m(U_n))$. From Proposition 2.10, (iv), the sequence $\{A(x, t, \nabla(T_{2m}(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla(\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+)\}$ converges to $F_{2m} \cdot \nabla(\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+)$ weakly in $L^1(Q)$. From Remark 3.2 and the convergence of $\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+$ in X to 0 as δ_1 tends to 0, we find

$$A_2 = \int_Q (k - T_k(U)) H_m(U) F_{2m} \cdot \nabla(\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+) + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \delta_1).$$

Then consider A_4 . Then for some $c_1 = c_1(p, \Lambda_2)$,

$$|A_4| \leq c_1 \frac{2k}{m} \int_{\{-2m < U_n \leq -m\}} (|\nabla u_n|^p + |\nabla U_n|^p + |a|^{p'}) \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+.$$

Since $\psi_{\delta_1}^+$ takes its values in $[0, 1]$, from Lemma 3.3, we get in particular $A_4 = \omega(n, \delta_1, m, \delta_2)$.

Now we estimate A_5 . The sequence $\{(k - T_k(U_n)) H_m(U_n) \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+\}$ converges to $(k - T_k(U)) H_m(U) \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+$, weakly in X , and $\{(k - T_k(U_n)) H_m(U_n)\}$ converges to $(k - T_k(U)) H_m(U)$, weak-* in $L^\infty(Q)$ and *a.e.* in \bar{Q} . Otherwise $\{f_n\}$ converges to f weakly in $L^1(Q)$ and $\{g_n\}$ converges to g strongly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$. From Remark 3.2 and the convergence of $\psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+$ to 0 in X and *a.e.* in Q as $\delta_1 \rightarrow 0$, we deduce that

$$A_5 = - \int_Q (k - T_k(U_n)) H_m(U) \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ d\hat{\nu}_0 + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \delta_1),$$

where $\hat{\nu}_0 = f - \text{div } g$.

Finally $A_6 \leq 2k \int_Q \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ d\eta_n$; using (3.2) we also find $A_6 \leq \omega(n, \delta_1, m, \delta_2)$. By addition, since A_3 does not depend on m , we obtain

$$A_3 = \int_Q \psi_{\delta_1}^+ \psi_{\delta_2}^+ A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla T_k(U_n) \leq \omega(n, \delta_1, \delta_2).$$

Arguing as before with $(\psi_{\delta_1}^- \psi_{\delta_2}^-, \check{S}_{k,m})$ as test function in (2.2), where $\check{S}_{k,m}(r) = -\hat{S}_{k,m}(-r)$, we get in the same way

$$\int_Q \psi_{\delta_1}^- \psi_{\delta_2}^- A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla T_k(U_n) \leq \omega(n, \delta_1, \delta_2).$$

Then, (3.18) holds. ■

Next we look at the behaviour far from E .

Lemma 3.5 . *Estimate (3.8) holds.*

Proof. Here we estimate I_2 ; we can write

$$I_2 = \int_{\{|U_n| \leq k\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \nabla (T_k(U_n) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu).$$

Following the ideas of [25], used also in [22], we define, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\ell > 2k > 0$,

$$R_{n,\nu,\ell} = T_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) - T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n)).$$

Recall that $\|\langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu\|_{\infty,Q} \leq k$, and observe that

$$R_{n,\nu,\ell} = 2k \operatorname{sign}(U_n) \quad \text{in } \{|U_n| \geq \ell + 2k\}, \quad |R_{n,\nu,\ell}| \leq 4k, \quad R_{n,\nu,\ell} = \omega(n, \nu, \ell) \text{ a.e. in } Q, \quad (3.19)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_{n,\nu,\ell} = T_{\ell+k}(U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) - T_{\ell-k}(U - T_k(U)), \quad \text{a.e. in } Q, \text{ and weakly in } X. \quad (3.20)$$

Next consider $\xi_{1,n_1} \in C_c^\infty([0, T])$, $\xi_{2,n_2} \in C_c^\infty((0, T])$ with values in $[0, 1]$, such that $(\xi_{1,n_1})_t \leq 0$ and $(\xi_{2,n_2})_t \geq 0$; and $\{\xi_{1,n_1}(t)\}$ (resp. $\{\xi_{2,n_2}(t)\}$) converges to 1, for any $t \in [0, T]$ (resp. $t \in (0, T]$); and moreover, for any $a \in C([0, T]; L^1(\Omega))$, $\left\{ \int_Q a(\xi_{1,n_1})_t \right\}$ and $\int_Q a(\xi_{2,n_2})_t$ converge respectively to $-\int_\Omega a(\cdot, T)dx$ and $\int_\Omega a(\cdot, 0)dx$. We set

$$\varphi = \varphi_{n,n_1,n_2,l_1,l_2,\ell} = \xi_{1,n_1}(1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2})[T_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} - \xi_{2,n_2}(1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2})[T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n))]_{-l_2}.$$

We observe that

$$\varphi - (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2})R_{n,\nu,\ell} = \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2) \quad \text{in norm in } X \text{ and a.e. in } Q. \quad (3.21)$$

We can choose $(\varphi, S) = (\varphi_{n,n_1,n_2,l_1,l_2,\ell}, \overline{H_m})$ as test functions in (2.7) for u_n , where $\overline{H_m}$ is defined at (2.14), with $m > \ell + 2k$. We obtain

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + A_5 = A_6 + A_7,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \int_\Omega \varphi(T) \overline{H_m}(U_n(T)) dx, & A_2 &= - \int_\Omega \varphi(0) \overline{H_m}(u_{0,n}) dx, & A_3 &= - \int_Q \varphi_t \overline{H_m}(U_n), \\ A_4 &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla \varphi, & A_5 &= \int_Q \varphi H'_m(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n, \\ A_6 &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) \varphi d\widehat{\lambda_{n,0}}, & A_7 &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) \varphi d(\rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}). \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of A_4 . This term allows to study I_2 . Indeed, $\{H_m(U_n)\}$ converges to 1, a.e. in Q ; From (3.21), (3.19) (3.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla R_{n,\nu,\ell} - \int_Q R_{n,\nu,\ell} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2} + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m) \\ &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla R_{n,\nu,\ell} + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell) \\ &= I_2 + \int_{\{|U_n| > k\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla R_{n,\nu,\ell} + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell) \\ &= I_2 + B_1 + B_2 + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \int_{\{|U_n| > k\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}) (\chi_{|U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu| \leq \ell+k} - \chi_{|U_n - k| \leq \ell-k}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n, \\ B_2 &= - \int_{\{|U_n| > k\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}) \chi_{|U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu| \leq \ell+k} A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\{A(x, t, \nabla(T_{\ell+2k}(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu\}$ converges to $F_{\ell+2k} \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu$, weakly in $L^1(Q)$. Otherwise $\left\{ \chi_{|U_n| > k} \chi_{|U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu| \leq \ell + k} \right\}$ converges to $\chi_{|U| > k} \chi_{|U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu| \leq \ell + k}$, *a.e.* in Q . And $\{\langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu\}$ converges to $T_k(U)$ strongly in X . From Remark 3.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 &= - \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) \chi_{|U| > k} \chi_{|U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu| \leq \ell + k} F_{\ell+2k} \cdot \nabla \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu + \omega(n) \\ &= - \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) \chi_{|U| > k} \chi_{|U - T_k(U)| \leq \ell + k} F_{\ell+2k} \cdot \nabla T_k(U) + \omega(n, \nu) = \omega(n, \nu), \end{aligned}$$

since $\nabla T_k(U) \chi_{|U| > k} = 0$. Besides, we see that, for some $c_1 = c_1(p, \Lambda_2)$,

$$|B_1| \leq c_1 \int_{\{\ell - 2k \leq |U_n| < \ell + 2k\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) (|\nabla u_n|^p + |\nabla U_n|^p + |a|^{p'}) .$$

Using (3.3) and (3.4) and applying (3.15) and (3.16) to $1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}$, we obtain, for $k > 0$,

$$\int_{\{m \leq |U_n| < m + 4k\}} (|\nabla u_n|^p + |\nabla U_n|^p) (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) = \omega(n, m, \delta_1, \delta_2). \quad (3.22)$$

Thus, $B_1 = \omega(n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2)$, hence $B_1 + B_2 = \omega(n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2)$. Then

$$A_4 = I_2 + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2). \quad (3.23)$$

Estimate of A_5 . For $m > \ell + 2k$, since $|\varphi| \leq 2\ell$, and (3.21) holds, we get, from the dominated convergence Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} A_5 &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) R_{n, \nu, \ell} H'_m(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2) \\ &= - \frac{2k}{m} \int_{\{m \leq |U_n| < 2m\}} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2); \end{aligned}$$

here, the final equality followed from the relation, since $m > \ell + 2k$,

$$R_{n, \nu, \ell} H'_m(U_n) = - \frac{2k}{m} \chi_{m \leq |U_n| \leq 2m}, \quad \text{a.e. in } Q. \quad (3.24)$$

Next we go to the limit in m , by using (2.3), (2.4) for u_n , with $\phi = (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})$. There holds

$$A_5 = -2k \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) d((\rho_{n, s} - \eta_{n, s})^+ + (\rho_{n, s} - \eta_{n, s})^-) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m).$$

Then, from (3.3) and (3.4), we get $A_5 = \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2)$.

Estimate of A_6 . Again, from (3.21),

$$\begin{aligned} A_6 &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) \varphi f_n + \int_Q g_n \cdot \nabla (H_m(U_n) \varphi) \\ &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) R_{n, \nu, \ell} f_n + \int_Q g_n \cdot \nabla (H_m(U_n) (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) R_{n, \nu, \ell}) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can write $A_6 = D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4 + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \int_Q H_m(U_n)(1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})R_{n, \nu, \ell} f_n, & D_2 &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})R_{n, \nu, \ell} H'_m(U_n) g_n \cdot \nabla U_n, \\ D_3 &= \int_Q H_m(U_n)(1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})g_n \cdot \nabla R_{n, \nu, \ell}, & D_4 &= - \int_Q H_m(U_n)R_{n, \nu, \ell} g_n \cdot \nabla \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges to f weakly in $L^1(Q)$, and (3.19)-(3.20) hold, we get, from Remark 3.2,

$$D_1 = \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) (T_{\ell+k}(U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) - T_{\ell-k}(U - T_k(U))) f + \omega(m, n) = \omega(m, n, \nu, \ell).$$

We deduce from (2.10) that $D_2 = \omega(m)$. Next consider D_3 . Note that $H_m(U_n) = 1 + \omega(m)$, and (3.20) holds, and $\{g_n\}$ converges to g strongly in $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$, and $\langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu$ converges to $T_k(U)$ strongly in X . Then we obtain successively that

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) g \cdot \nabla (T_{\ell+k}(U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) - T_{\ell-k}(U - T_k(U))) + \omega(m, n) \\ &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) g \cdot \nabla (T_{\ell+k}(U - T_k(U)) - T_{\ell-k}(U - T_k(U))) + \omega(m, n, \nu) \\ &= \omega(m, n, \nu, \ell). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we also get $D_4 = \omega(m, n, \nu, \ell)$. Thus $A_6 = \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2)$.

Estimate of A_7 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_7| &= \left| \int_Q S'_m(U_n) (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) R_{n, \nu, \ell} d(\rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}) \right| + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2) \\ &\leq 4k \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) d(\rho_n + \eta_n) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.3) and (3.4) we get $A_7 = \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2)$.

Estimate of $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$. We set

$$J(r) = T_{\ell-k}(r - T_k(r)), \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{R},$$

and use the notations $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ and \mathcal{J} of (2.11). From the definitions of $\xi_{1, n_1}, \xi_{1, n_2}$, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 + A_2 &= - \int_\Omega J(U_n(T)) \overline{H_m}(U_n(T)) dx - \int_\Omega T_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_\nu) \overline{H_m}(u_{0,n}) dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2) \\ &= - \int_\Omega J(U_n(T)) U_n(T) dx - \int_\Omega T_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_\nu) u_{0,n} dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m), \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

where $z_\nu = \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu(0)$. We can write $A_3 = F_1 + F_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= - \int_Q \left(\xi_{n_1} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [T_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} \right)_t \overline{H_m}(U_n), \\ F_2 &= \int_Q \left(\xi_{n_2} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n))]_{-l_2} \right)_t \overline{H_m}(U_n). \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of F_2 . We write $F_2 = G_1 + G_2 + G_3$, with

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= - \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t \xi_{n_2} [T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n))]_{-l_2} \overline{H_m}(U_n), \\ G_2 &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})(\xi_{n_2})_t [T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n))]_{-l_2} \overline{H_m}(U_n), \\ G_3 &= \int_Q \xi_{n_2} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) ([T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n))]_{-l_2})_t \overline{H_m}(U_n). \end{aligned}$$

We find easily that

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= - \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t J(U_n) U_n + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m), \\ G_2 &= \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})(\xi_{n_2})_t J(U_n) \overline{H_m}(U_n) + \omega(l_1, l_2) = \int_{\Omega} J(u_{0,n}) u_{0,n} dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m). \end{aligned}$$

Next consider G_3 . Setting $b = \overline{H_m}(U_n)$, there holds from (2.13) and (2.12),

$$([J(b)]_{-l_2})_t b(\cdot, t) = \frac{b(\cdot, t)}{l_2} (J(b)(\cdot, t) - J(b)(\cdot, t - l_2)).$$

Hence

$$([T_{\ell-k}(U_n - T_k(U_n))]_{-l_2})_t \overline{H_m}(U_n) \geq ([\mathcal{J}(\overline{H_m}(U_n))]_{-l_2})_t = ([\mathcal{J}(U_n)]_{-l_2})_t,$$

since \mathcal{J} is constant in $\{|r| \geq m + \ell + 2k\}$. Integrating by parts in G_3 , we find

$$\begin{aligned} G_3 &\geq \int_Q \xi_{2,n_2} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) ([\mathcal{J}(U_n)]_{-l_2})_t = - \int_Q (\xi_{2,n_2} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}))_t [\mathcal{J}(U_n)]_{-l_2} + \int_{\Omega} \xi_{2,n_2}(T) [\mathcal{J}(U_n)]_{-l_2}(T) dx \\ &= - \int_Q (\xi_{2,n_2})_t (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) \mathcal{J}(U_n) + \int_Q \xi_{2,n_2} (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t \mathcal{J}(U_n) + \int_{\Omega} \xi_{2,n_2}(T) \mathcal{J}(U_n(T)) dx + \omega(l_1, l_2) \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{J}(u_{0,n}) dx + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t \mathcal{J}(U_n) + \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{J}(U_n(T)) dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\mathcal{J}(U_n) - J(U_n)U_n = -\overline{\mathcal{J}}(U_n)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{J}}(u_{0,n}) = J(u_{0,n})u_{0,n} - \mathcal{J}(u_{0,n})$, we obtain

$$F_2 \geq \int_{\Omega} \overline{\mathcal{J}}(u_{0,n}) dx - \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t \overline{\mathcal{J}}(U_n) + \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{J}(U_n(T)) dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m). \quad (3.26)$$

Estimate of F_1 . Since $m > \ell + 2k$, there holds $T_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) = T_{\ell+k}(\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_{\nu})$ on $\text{supp} \overline{H_m}(U_n)$. Hence we can write $F_1 = L_1 + L_2$, with

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= - \int_Q \left(\xi_{1,n_1} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [T_{\ell+k}(\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_{\nu})]_{l_1} \right)_t (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_{\nu}) \\ L_2 &= - \int_Q \left(\xi_{1,n_1} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [T_{\ell+k}(\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_{\nu})]_{l_1} \right)_t \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_{\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts we have, by definition of the Landes-time approximation,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_2 &= \int_Q \xi_{1,n_1} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [T_{\ell+k} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} (\langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)_t \\
&\quad + \int_\Omega \xi_{1,n_1} (0) [T_{\ell+k} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} (0) \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu (0) dx \\
&= \nu \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) T_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) (T_k(U) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) + \int_\Omega T_{\ell+k} (u_{0,n} - z_\nu) z_\nu dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

We decompose L_1 into $L_1 = K_1 + K_2 + K_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &= - \int_Q (\xi_{1,n_1})_t (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [T_{\ell+k} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu) \\
K_2 &= \int_Q \xi_{1,n_1} (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t [T_{\ell+k} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu) \\
K_3 &= - \int_Q \xi_{1,n_1} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) \left([T_{\ell+k} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} \right)_t (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we check easily that

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &= \int_\Omega T_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) (T) (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) (T) dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m), \\
K_2 &= \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t T_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m).
\end{aligned}$$

Next consider K_3 . Here we use the function \mathcal{T}_k defined at (2.13). We set $b = \overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu$. Hence from (2.12),

$$\begin{aligned}
([T_{\ell+k}(b)]_{l_1})_t b(\cdot, t) &= \frac{b(\cdot, t)}{l_1} (T_{\ell+k}(b)(\cdot, t + l_1) - T_{\ell+k}(b)(\cdot, t)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{l_1} (\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(b)((\cdot, t + l_1)) - \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(b)(\cdot, t)) = ([\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(b)]_{l_1})_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$([T_{\ell+k} (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1})_t (\overline{H_m}(U_n) - \langle T_k(\overline{H_m}(U)) \rangle_\nu) \leq ([\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1})_t.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
K_3 &\geq - \int_Q \xi_{1,n_1} (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) ([\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1})_t \\
&= \int_Q (\xi_{1,n_1})_t (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) [\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} - \int_Q \xi_{1,n_1} (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t [\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} \\
&\quad + \int_\Omega \xi_{1,n_1} (0) [\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu)]_{l_1} (0) dx \\
&= - \int_\Omega \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n(T) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu(T)) dx - \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_\nu) \\
&\quad + \int_\Omega \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k} (u_{0,n} - z_\nu) dx + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2).
\end{aligned}$$

We find by addition, since $T_{\ell+k}(r) - \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(r) = \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(r)$ for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 \geq & \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu}) dx + \int_{\Omega} \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n(T) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}(T)) dx \\ & + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

We deduce from (3.28), (3.27), (3.26),

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 \geq & \int_{\Omega} \overline{J}(u_{0,n}) dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu}) dx + \int_{\Omega} T_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu}) z_{\nu} dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n(T) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}(T)) dx + \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{J}(U_n(T)) dx + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) - \overline{J}(U_n)) \\ & + \nu \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) T_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) (T_k(U) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m). \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Next we add (3.25) and (3.29). Note that $\mathcal{J}(U_n(T)) - J(U_n(T))U_n(T) = -\overline{J}(U_n(T))$, and also

$$\mathcal{T}_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu}) - T_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu})(z_{\nu} - u_{0,n}) = -\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu}).$$

Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \geq & \int_{\Omega} (\overline{J}(u_{0,n}) - \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(u_{0,n} - z_{\nu})) dx + \int_{\Omega} (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n(T) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}(T)) - \overline{J}(U_n(T))) dx \\ & + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) - \overline{J}(U_n)) \\ & + \nu \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) T_{\ell+k}(U_n - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) (T_k(U) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(r-s) - \overline{J}(r) \geq 0$ for any $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|s| \leq k$; thus

$$\int_{\Omega} (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U_n(T) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}(T)) - \overline{J}(U_n(T))) dx \geq 0.$$

And $\{u_{0,n}\}$ converges to u_0 in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $\{U_n\}$ converges to U in $L^1(Q)$ from Proposition 2.10. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \geq & \int_{\Omega} (\overline{J}(u_0) - \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(u_0 - z_{\nu})) dx + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) - \overline{J}(U)) \\ & + \nu \int_Q (1 - \Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}) T_{\ell+k}(U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) (T_k(U) - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover $T_{\ell+k}(r-s)(T_k(r) - s) \geq 0$ for any $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|s| \leq k$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \geq & \int_{\Omega} (\overline{J}(u_0) - \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(u_0 - z_{\nu})) dx + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U - \langle T_k(U) \rangle_{\nu}) - \overline{J}(U)) \\ & + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n). \end{aligned}$$

As $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, $\{z_\nu\}$ converges to $T_k(u_0)$, a.e. in Ω , thus we get

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \geq \int_{\Omega} (\overline{J}(u_0) - \overline{T}_{\ell+k}(u_0 - T_k(u_0))) dx + \int_Q (\Phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2})_t (\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(U - T_k(U)) - \overline{J}(U)) \\ + \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu).$$

Finally $|\overline{T}_{\ell+k}(r - T_k(r)) - \overline{J}(r)| \leq 2k|r|\chi_{\{|r| \geq \ell\}}$ for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, thus

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \geq \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell).$$

Combining all the estimates, we obtain $I_2 \leq \omega(l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, n, \nu, \ell, \delta_1, \delta_2)$, which implies (3.8), since I_2 does not depend on $l_1, l_2, n_1, n_2, m, \ell$. \blacksquare

Next we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1:

Lemma 3.6 *The function u is a R -solution of (1.1).*

Proof. (i) First show that u satisfies (2.2). Here we proceed as in [22]. Let $\varphi \in X \cap L^\infty(Q)$ such $\varphi_t \in X' + L^1(Q)$, $\varphi(\cdot, T) = 0$, and $S \in W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, such that S' has compact support on \mathbb{R} , $S(0) = 0$. Let $M > 0$ such that $\text{supp} S' \subset [-M, M]$. Taking successively (φ, S) and $(\varphi\psi_\delta^\pm, S)$ as test functions in (2.2) applied to u_n , we can write

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 = A_5 + A_6 + A_7, \quad A_{2,\delta,\pm} + A_{3,\delta,\pm} + A_{4,\delta,\pm} = A_{5,\delta,\pm} + A_{6,\delta,\pm} + A_{7,\delta,\pm},$$

where

$$A_1 = - \int_{\Omega} \varphi(0) S(u_{0,n}) dx, \quad A_2 = - \int_Q \varphi_t S(U_n), \quad A_{2,\delta,\pm} = - \int_Q (\varphi\psi_\delta^\pm)_t S(U_n), \\ A_3 = \int_Q S'(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla \varphi, \quad A_{3,\delta,\pm} = \int_Q S'(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (\varphi\psi_\delta^\pm), \\ A_4 = \int_Q S''(U_n) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n, \quad A_{4,\delta,\pm} = \int_Q S''(U_n) \varphi\psi_\delta^\pm A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n, \\ A_5 = \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi d\widehat{\lambda}_{n,0}, \quad A_6 = \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi d\rho_{n,0}, \quad A_7 = - \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi d\eta_{n,0}, \\ A_{5,\delta,\pm} = \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi\psi_\delta^\pm d\widehat{\lambda}_{n,0}, \quad A_{6,\delta,\pm} = \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi\psi_\delta^\pm d\rho_{n,0}, \quad A_{7,\delta,\pm} = - \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi\psi_\delta^\pm d\eta_{n,0}.$$

Since $\{u_{0,n}\}$ converges to u_0 in $L^1(\Omega)$, and $\{S(U_n)\}$ converges to $S(U)$, strongly in X and weak-* in $L^\infty(Q)$, there holds, from (3.2),

$$A_1 = - \int_{\Omega} \varphi(0) S(u_0) dx + \omega(n), \quad A_2 = - \int_Q \varphi_t S(U) + \omega(n), \quad A_{2,\delta,\psi_\delta^\pm} = \omega(n, \delta).$$

Moreover $T_M(U_n)$ converges to $T_M(U)$, then $T_M(U_n) + h_n$ converges to $T_k(U) + h$ strongly in X , thus

$$A_3 = \int_Q S'(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla (T_M(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_Q S'(U) A(x, t, \nabla (T_M(U) + h)) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \omega(n) \\ = \int_Q S'(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \omega(n);$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 &= \int_Q S''(U_n) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla (T_M(U_n) + h_n)) \cdot \nabla T_M(U_n) \\ &= \int_Q S''(U) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla (T_M(U) + h)) \cdot \nabla T_M(U) + \omega(n) = \int_Q S''(U) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U + \omega(n). \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, since ψ_δ^\pm converges to 0 in X ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{3,\delta,\pm} &= \int_Q S'(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla (\varphi \psi_\delta^\pm) + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \delta), \\ A_{4,\delta,\pm} &= \int_Q S''(U) \varphi \psi_\delta^\pm A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

And $\{g_n\}$ strongly converges to g in $(L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_5 &= \int_Q S'(U_n) \varphi f_n + \int_Q S'(U_n) g_n \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_Q S''(U_n) \varphi g_n \cdot \nabla T_M(U_n) \\ &= \int_Q S'(U) \varphi f + \int_Q S'(U) g \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_Q S''(U) \varphi g \cdot \nabla T_M(U) + \omega(n) \\ &= \int_Q S'(U) \varphi d\widehat{\mu}_0 + \omega(n). \end{aligned}$$

Now $A_{5,\delta,\pm} = \int_Q S'(U) \varphi \psi_\delta^\pm d\widehat{\lambda}_{n,0} + \omega(n) = \omega(n, \delta)$. Then $A_{6,\delta,\pm} + A_{7,\delta,\pm} = \omega(n, \delta)$. From (3.2) we verify that $A_{7,\delta,+} = \omega(n, \delta)$ and $A_{6,\delta,-} = \omega(n, \delta)$. Moreover, from (3.6) and (3.2), we find

$$|A_6 - A_{6,\delta,+}| \leq \int_Q |S'(U_n) \varphi| (1 - \psi_\delta^+) d\rho_{n,0} \leq \|S\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R})} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^+) d\rho_n = \omega(n, \delta).$$

Similarly we also have $|A_7 - A_{7,\delta,-}| \leq \omega(n, \delta)$. Hence $A_6 = \omega(n)$ and $A_7 = \omega(n)$. Therefore, we finally obtain (2.2):

$$-\int_\Omega \varphi(0) S(u_0) dx - \int_Q \varphi_t S(U) + \int_Q S'(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_Q S''(U) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \int_Q S'(U) \varphi d\widehat{\mu}_0. \quad (3.30)$$

(ii) Next, we prove (2.3) and (2.4). We take $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(Q)$ and take $((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi, \overline{H_m})$ as test functions in (3.30), with $\overline{H_m}$ as in (2.14). We can write $D_{1,m} + D_{2,m} = D_{3,m} + D_{4,m} + D_{5,m}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1,m} &= - \int_Q ((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi)_t \overline{H_m}(U), & D_{2,m} &= \int_Q H_m(U) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla ((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi), \\ D_{3,m} &= \int_Q H_m(U) (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d\widehat{\mu}_0, & D_{4,m} &= \frac{1}{m} \int_{m \leq U \leq 2m} (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U, \\ D_{5,m} &= - \frac{1}{m} \int_{-2m \leq U \leq -m} (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

Taking the same test functions in (2.2) applied to u_n , there holds $D_{1,m}^n + D_{2,m}^n = D_{3,m}^n + D_{4,m}^n + D_{5,m}^n$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1,m}^n &= - \int_Q ((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi)_t \overline{H_m}(U_n), & D_{2,m}^n &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla ((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi), \\ D_{3,m}^n &= \int_Q H_m(U_n) (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d(\widehat{\lambda_{n,0}} + \rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}), & D_{4,m}^n &= \frac{1}{m} \int_{m \leq U \leq 2m} (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n, \\ D_{5,m}^n &= - \frac{1}{m} \int_{-2m \leq U_n \leq -m} (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla U_n \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

In (3.32), we go to the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\{\overline{H_m}(U_n)\}$ converges to U_n and $\{H_m(U_n)\}$ converges to 1, *a.e.* in Q , and $\{\nabla H_m(U_n)\}$ converges to 0, weakly in $(L^p(Q))^N$, we obtain the relation $D_1^n + D_2^n = D_3^n + D^n$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1^n &= - \int_Q ((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi)_t U_n, & D_2^n &= \int_Q A(x, t, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla ((1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi), & D_3^n &= \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d\widehat{\lambda_{n,0}} \\ D^n &= \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d(\rho_{n,0} - \eta_{n,0}) + \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d((\rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s})^+ - (\rho_{n,s} - \eta_{n,s})^-) \\ &= \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d(\rho_n - \eta_n). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $D_{i,m} - D_i^n = \omega(n, m)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. From Lemma (3.3) and (3.2)-(3.4), we obtain $D_{5,m} = \omega(n, m, \delta)$, and

$$\frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \psi_\delta^- \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \omega(n, m, \delta),$$

thus,

$$D_{4,m} = \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U + \omega(n, m, \delta).$$

Since $\left| \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d\eta_n \right| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) d\eta_n$, it follows that $\int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d\eta_n = \omega(n, m, \delta)$ from (3.4). And $\left| \int_Q \psi_\delta^- \varphi d\rho_n \right| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \int_Q \psi_\delta^- d\rho_n$, thus, from (3.2), $\int_Q (1 - \psi_\delta^-) \varphi d\rho_n = \int_Q \varphi d\mu_s^+ + \omega(n, m, \delta)$. Then $D^n = \int_Q \varphi d\mu_s^+ + \omega(n, m, \delta)$. Therefore by subtraction, we get successively

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U &= \int_Q \varphi d\mu_s^+ + \omega(n, m, \delta), \\ \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U &= \int_Q \varphi d\mu_s^+, \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

which proves (2.3) when $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(Q)$. Next assume only $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{Q})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi \psi_\delta^+ A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi (1 - \psi_\delta^+) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U \\ &= \int_Q \varphi \psi_\delta^+ d\mu_s^+ + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi (1 - \psi_\delta^+) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \int_Q \varphi d\mu_s^+ + D, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$D = \int_Q \varphi(1 - \psi_\delta^+) d\mu_s^+ + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\{m \leq U < 2m\}} \varphi(1 - \psi_\delta^+) A(x, t, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla U = \omega(\delta).$$

Therefore, (3.33) still holds for $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{Q})$, and we deduce (2.3) by density, and similarly, (2.4). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \blacksquare

4 Approximations of measures

Corollary 1.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 and the following approximation property:

Proposition 4.1 *Let $\mu = \mu_0 + \mu_s \in \mathcal{M}_b^+(Q)$ with $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^+(Q)$ and $\mu_s \in \mathcal{M}_s^+(Q)$.*

(i) Then, we can find a decomposition $\mu_0 = (f, g, h)$ with $f \in L^1(Q)$, $g \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N$, $h \in X$ such that

$$\|f\|_{1,Q} + \|g\|_{p',Q} + \|h\|_X + \mu_s(\Omega) \leq 2\mu(Q) \quad (4.1)$$

(ii) Furthermore, there exists sequences of measures $\mu_{0,n} = (f_n, g_n, h_n)$, $\mu_{s,n}$ such that $f_n, g_n, h_n \in C_c^\infty(Q)$ strongly converge to f, g, h in $L^1(Q)$, $(L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and X respectively, and $\mu_{s,n} \in (C_c^\infty(Q))^+$ converges to μ_s and $\mu_n := \mu_{0,n} + \mu_{s,n}$ converges to μ in the narrow topology, and satisfying $|\mu_n|(Q) \leq \mu(Q)$,

$$\|f_n\|_{1,Q} + \|g_n\|_{p',Q} + \|h_n\|_X + \mu_{s,n}(Q) \leq 2\mu(Q). \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. (i) Step 1. Case where μ has a compact support in Q . By [15], we can find a decomposition $\mu_0 = (f, g, h)$ with f, g, h have a compact support in Q . Let $\{\varphi_n\}$ be sequence of mollifiers in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} . Then $\mu_{0,n} = \varphi_n * \mu_0 \in C_c^\infty(Q)$ for n large enough. We see that $\mu_{0,n}(Q) = \mu_0(Q)$ and $\mu_{0,n}$ admits the decomposition $\mu_{0,n} = (f_n, g_n, h_n) = (\varphi_n * f, \varphi_n * g, \varphi_n * h)$. Since $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}, \{h_n\}$ strongly converge to f, g, h in $L^1(Q), (L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and X respectively, we have for n_0 large enough,

$$\|f - f_{n_0}\|_{1,Q} + \|g - g_{n_0}\|_{p',Q} + \|h - h_{n_0}\|_{L^{p'}((0,T);W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))} \leq \frac{1}{2}\mu_0(Q).$$

Then we obtain a decomposition $\mu = (\hat{f}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) = (\mu_{n_0} + f - f_{n_0}, g - g_{n_0}, h - h_{n_0})$, such that

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{1,Q} + \|\hat{g}\|_{p',Q} + \|\hat{h}\|_X + \mu_s(Q) \leq \frac{3}{2}\mu(Q) \quad (4.3)$$

Step 2. General case. Let $\{\theta_n\}$ be a nonnegative, nondecreasing sequence in $C_c^\infty(Q)$ which converges to 1, a.e. in Q . Set $\tilde{\mu}_0 = \theta_0\mu$, and $\tilde{\mu}_n = (\theta_n - \theta_{n-1})\mu$, for any $n \geq 1$. Since $\tilde{\mu}_n = \tilde{\mu}_{0,n} + \tilde{\mu}_{s,n} \in \mathcal{M}_0(Q) \cap \mathcal{M}_b^+(Q)$ has compact support with $\tilde{\mu}_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_0(Q)$, $\tilde{\mu}_{s,n} \in \mathcal{M}_s(Q)$, by Step 1, we can find a decomposition $\tilde{\mu}_{0,n} = (\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{g}_n, \tilde{h}_n)$ such that

$$\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{1,Q} + \|\tilde{g}_n\|_{p',Q} + \|\tilde{h}_n\|_X + \tilde{\mu}_{s,n}(\Omega) \leq \frac{3}{2}\tilde{\mu}_n(Q).$$

Let $\bar{f}_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{f}_k$, $\bar{g}_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{g}_k$, $\bar{h}_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{h}_k$ and $\bar{\mu}_{s,n} = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{\mu}_{s,k}$. Clearly, $\theta_n\mu_0 = (\bar{f}_n, \bar{g}_n, \bar{h}_n)$, $\theta_n\mu_s = \bar{\mu}_{s,n}$ and $\{\bar{f}_n\}, \{\bar{g}_n\}, \{\bar{h}_n\}$ and $\{\bar{\mu}_{s,n}\}$ converge strongly to some f, g, h , and μ_s respectively in $L^1(Q), (L^{p'}(Q))^N$, X and $\mathcal{M}_b^+(Q)$, and

$$\|\bar{f}_n\|_{1,Q} + \|\bar{g}_n\|_{p',Q} + \|\bar{h}_n\|_X + \bar{\mu}_{s,n}(Q) \leq \frac{3}{2}\mu(Q).$$

Therefore, $\mu_0 = (f, g, h)$, and (4.1) holds.

(ii) We take a sequence $\{m_n\}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $f_n = \varphi_{m_n} * \bar{f}_n$, $g_n = \varphi_{m_n} * \bar{g}_n$, $h_n = \varphi_{m_n} * \bar{h}_n$, $\varphi_{m_n} * \bar{\mu}_{s,n} \in (C_c^\infty(Q))^+$, $\int_Q \varphi_{m_n} * \bar{\mu}_{s,n} dx dt = \bar{\mu}_{s,n}(Q)$ and

$$\|f_n - \bar{f}_n\|_{1,Q} + \|g_n - \bar{g}_n\|_{p',Q} + \|h_n - \bar{h}_n\|_X \leq \frac{1}{n+2} \mu(Q).$$

Let $\mu_{0,n} = \varphi_{m_n} * (\theta_n \mu_0) = (f_n, g_n, h_n)$, $\mu_{s,n} = \varphi_{m_n} * \bar{\mu}_{s,n}$ and $\mu_n = \mu_{0,n} + \mu_{s,n}$. Therefore, $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}, \{h_n\}$ strongly converge to f, g, h in $L^1(Q), (L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and X respectively. And (4.2) holds. Furthermore, $\{\mu_{s,n}\}, \{\mu_n\}$ converge to μ_s, μ in the weak topology of measures, and $\mu_{s,n}(Q) = \int_Q \theta_n d\mu_s$, $\mu_n(Q) = \int_Q \theta_n d\mu$ converges to $\mu_s(Q), \mu(Q)$, thus $\{\mu_{s,n}\}, \{\mu_n\}$ converges to μ_s, μ in the narrow topology and $|\mu_n|(Q) \leq \mu(Q)$. ■

Observe that part (i) of Proposition 4.1 was used in [22], even if there was no explicit proof. Otherwise part (ii) is a *key point* for finding applications to the stability Theorem. Note also a very useful consequence for approximations by *nondecreasing* sequences:

Proposition 4.2 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b^+(Q)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\{\mu_n\}$ be a nondecreasing sequence in $\mathcal{M}_b^+(Q)$ converging to μ in $\mathcal{M}_b(Q)$. Then, there exist $f_n, f \in L^1(Q)$, $g_n, g \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and $h_n, h \in X$, $\mu_{n,s}, \mu_s \in \mathcal{M}_s^+(Q)$ such that*

$$\mu = f - \operatorname{div} g + h_t + \mu_s, \quad \mu_n = f_n - \operatorname{div} g_n + (h_n)_t + \mu_{n,s},$$

and $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}, \{h_n\}$ strongly converge to f, g, h in $L^1(Q), (L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and X respectively, and $\{\mu_{n,s}\}$ converges to μ_s (strongly) in $\mathcal{M}_b(Q)$ and

$$\|f_n\|_{1,Q} + \|g_n\|_{p',Q} + \|h_n\|_X + \mu_{n,s}(\Omega) \leq 2\mu(Q). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Since $\{\mu_n\}$ is nondecreasing, then $\{\mu_{n,0}\}, \{\mu_{n,s}\}$ are nondecreasing too. Clearly, $\|\mu - \mu_n\|_{\mathcal{M}_b(Q)} = \|\mu_0 - \mu_{n,0}\|_{\mathcal{M}_b(Q)} + \|\mu_s - \mu_{n,s}\|_{\mathcal{M}_b(Q)}$. Hence, $\{\mu_{n,s}\}$ converges to μ_s and $\{\mu_{n,0}\}$ converges to μ_0 (strongly) in $\mathcal{M}_b(Q)$. Set $\tilde{\mu}_{0,0} = \mu_{0,0}$, and $\tilde{\mu}_{n,0} = \mu_{n,0} - \mu_{n-1,0}$ for any $n \geq 1$. By Proposition 4.1, (i), we can find $\tilde{f}_n \in L^1(Q)$, $\tilde{g}_n \in (L^{p'}(Q))^N$ and $\tilde{h}_n \in X$ such that $\tilde{\mu}_{n,0} = (\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{g}_n, \tilde{h}_n)$ and

$$\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{1,Q} + \|\tilde{g}_n\|_{p',Q} + \|\tilde{h}_n\|_X \leq 2\tilde{\mu}_{n,0}(Q)$$

Let $f_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{f}_k$, $G_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{g}_k$ and $h_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{h}_k$. Clearly, $\mu_{n,0} = (f_n, g_n, h_n)$ and the convergence properties hold with (4.4), since

$$\|f_n\|_{1,Q} + \|g_n\|_{p',Q} + \|h_n\|_X \leq 2\mu_0(Q).$$

■

References

- [1] Baras P. and Pierre M., *Problèmes paraboliques semi-linéaires avec données mesures*, Applicable Anal. 18 (1984), 111-149.
- [2] Bidaut-Véron M.F. and Nguyen-Quoc H., *Evolution equations of p-Laplace type with absorption or source terms and measure data*, Arxiv...
- [3] Bidaut-Véron M.F. and Nguyen-Quoc H., *Pointwise estimates and existence of solutions of porous medium and p-Laplace evolution equations with absorption and measure data*, Arxiv 1407-2218.

- [4] Benilan P., Boccardo L., Gallouet T., Gariepy R., Pierre M. and Vázquez J., *An L^1 -theory of existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 22 (1995), no. 2, 241–273.
- [5] Blanchard D. and Murat F., *Renormalized solutions of nonlinear parabolic equation with L^1 data: existence and uniqueness*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh 127A (1997), 1153–1179.
- [6] Blanchard D., Petitta F. and Redwane H., *Renormalized solutions of nonlinear parabolic equations with diffuse measure data*, Manuscripta Math. 141 (2013), 601–635.
- [7] Blanchard D. and Porretta A., *Stefan problems with nonlinear diffusion and convection*, J. Diff. Equ. 210 (2005), 383–428.
- [8] Blanchard D. and Porretta A., *Nonlinear parabolic equations with natural growth terms and measure initial data*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, 30 (2001), 583–622.
- [9] Boccardo L. and Gallouet T., *Nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations involving measure data*, J Funct. Anal. 87 (1989), 149–169.
- [10] Boccardo L. and Gallouet T., *Nonlinear elliptic equations with right-hand side measures*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equ. 17 (1992), 641–655.
- [11] Boccardo L., Dall’Aglia A., Gallouet T. and Orsina L., *Nonlinear parabolic equations with measure data*, J. Funct. Anal. 147 (1997), 237–258.
- [12] Dall’Aglia A. and Orsina L., *Existence results for some nonlinear parabolic equations with nonregular data*, Diff. Int. Equ. 5 (1992), 1335–1354.
- [13] Di Benedetto E., *Degenerate parabolic equations*, Springer-Verlag (1993).
- [14] Dal Maso G., Murat F., Orsina L., and Prignet A., *Renormalized solutions of elliptic equations with general measure data*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, 28 (1999), 741–808.
- [15] Droniou J., Porretta A. and Prignet A., *Parabolic capacity and soft measures for nonlinear equations*, Potential Anal. 19 (2003), 99–161.
- [16] Droniou J. and Prignet A., *Equivalence between entropy and renormalized solutions for parabolic equations with smooth data*, Nonlinear Diff Eq. Appl. 14 (2007), 181–205.
- [17] Landes, R., *On the existence of weak solutions for quasilinear parabolic initial boundary-value problems*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh Sect A, 89(1981), 217–237.
- [18] Leonori T. and Petitta F., *Local estimates for parabolic equations with nonlinear gradient terms*, Calc. Var. Partial Diff. Equ. 42 (2011), 153–187.
- [19] Lions J.L., *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod et Gauthiers-Villars (1969).
- [20] Nguyen-Quoc H., *Potential estimates and quasilinear parabolic equations with measure data*, Arxiv 1405-2587.
- [21] Petitta F., *Asymptotic behavior of solutions for linear parabolic equations with general measure data*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 344 (2007) 571–576.

- [22] Petitta F., *Renormalized solutions of nonlinear parabolic equations with general measure data*, Ann. Math. Pura Appl. 187 (2008), 563-604.
- [23] Petitta F., Ponce A. and Porretta A., *Diffuse measures and nonlinear parabolic equations*, J. Evol. Equ. 11 (2011), 861-905.
- [24] Pierre M., *Parabolic capacity and Sobolev spaces*, Siam J. Math. Anal. 14 (1983), 522-533.
- [25] Porretta A., *Existence results for nonlinear parabolic equations via strong convergence of truncations*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. 177 (1999), 143-172.
- [26] Prignet A., *Existence and uniqueness of "entropy" solutions of parabolic problems with L^1 data*, Non-linear Anal. TMA 28 (1997), 1943-1954.
- [27] Xu, X., *On the initial boundary-value-problem for $u_t - \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} |\nabla u|) = 0$* , Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 127 (1994), 319-335.